

Gabriel S. Gross (Cal. Bar No. 254672)
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
140 Scott Drive
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Phone: (650) 328-4600
Email: gabe.gross@lw.com

Gabrielle LaHatte (Cal. Bar No. 321844)
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, California 94111
Phone: (415) 391-0600
Email: gabrielle.lahatte@lw.com

Jamie D. Underwood (*pro hac vice*)
Michael A. David (*pro hac vice*)
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304
Phone: (202) 637-2200
Email: jamie.underwood@lw.com
Email: michael.david@lw.com

Of Counsel:

J.C. Rozendaal (*pro hac vice*)
Michael Joffre (*pro hac vice*)
Deirdre Wells (*pro hac vice*)
Josephine Kim (Cal. Bar No. 295152)
Kristina Caggiano Kelly (*pro hac vice*)
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: (202) 371-2600
Email: jcrozendaal@sternekessler.com
Email: mjoffre@sternekessler.com
Email: dwells@sternekessler.com
Email: joskim@sternekessler.com
Email: kckelly@sternekessler.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Ascendis Pharma A/S, Ascendis Pharma Growth Disorders A/S, and Ascendis Pharma, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION**

ASCENDIS PHARMA A/S, ASCENDIS
PHARMA GROWTH DISORDERS A/S, and
ASCENDIS PHARMA, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

V.

BIOMARIN PHARMACEUTICAL INC.

Defendant.

Case No. 4:25-cv-03302-YGR

**PLAINTIFF ASCENDIS'S STATEMENT
OF NON-OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT'S ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER
CASES SHOULD BE RELATED**

Civ L.R. 7-3(h); Pat L.R. 2-1

1 Defendant BioMarin Pharmaceutical, Inc.’s administrative motion to consider whether this
 2 case should be related to a subsequent case that Plaintiffs filed involving the same patent (Dkt. No.
 3 46) is entirely unnecessary. This is because the Court’s Patent Local Rule 2-1 controls, not Civil
 4 Local Rule 3-12 which BioMarin relies on. Under the applicable Patent Local Rule the two actions
 5 already “will be deemed related” without a motion. *See* Pat. L.R. 2-1(a); *see also* Pat. L.R. 1-2.
 6 Plaintiffs have no objection to the Court considering whether the two actions should be related—
 7 though unnecessary—and so do not oppose the relief BioMarin purports to seek.

8 Plaintiffs Ascendis Pharma A/S, Ascendis Pharma Growth Disorders A/S, and Ascendis
 9 Pharma, Inc. (“Ascendis”) do, however, take issue with and object to (1) BioMarin’s erroneous
 10 suggestions that Ascendis failed to comply with the local rules and (2) BioMarin’s transparent
 11 attempt to use its “administrative” motion to preview its argument in opposition to another pending
 12 motion in the second case: Ascendis’s motion for a mandatory stay under 28 U.S.C. § 1659. Case
 13 No. 5:25-cv-5696-PCP, Dkt. No. 25 (N.D. Cal July 21, 2025). The Court need not consider these
 14 extraneous arguments and should give them no weight.

15 In short, Ascendis voluntarily dismissed this action (Dkt. No. 45) and subsequently filed a
 16 second action in this Court involving the same patent and raising different issues, Case No. 5:25-
 17 cv-05696-PCP. As BioMarin admits, in that second action Ascendis also promptly filed its required
 18 Notice of Pendency of Other Action Involving Same Patent, advising the Court of both actions. *See*
 19 Case No. 5:25-cv-5696-PCP, Dkt. No. 24 (N.D. Cal July 18, 2025). By rule, these two actions “will
 20 be deemed related” and “the Clerk will reassign the related higher-numbered case[] to the Judge
 21 assigned to the lowest-numbered case.” Pat. L.R. 2-1(a)(1), (3). This moots the need for an
 22 administrative motion like BioMarin’s to “consider” whether the cases should be related under Civil
 23 Local Rule 3-12. *See* Pat. L.R. 1-2 (“The Civil Local Rules of this Court shall also apply to such
 24 actions, *except* to the extent that they are inconsistent with these Patent Local Rules.”). While the
 25 Court thus could deny BioMarin’s motion as moot, Ascendis has no objection to the two actions
 26 being related, as Patent Local Rule 2-1(a) directs, and therefore does not oppose the motion, subject
 27 to the objections herein.

1 Dated: July 28, 2025

2 Of Counsel:

3 J.C. Rozendaal (*pro hac vice*)
 4 Michael Joffre (*pro hac vice*)
 5 Deirdre Wells (*pro hac vice*)
 6 Josephine Kim (Cal. Bar No. 295152)
 7 Kristina Caggiano Kelly (*pro hac vice*)
8 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN &
9 FOX P.L.L.C.
 10 1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
 11 Washington, D.C. 20005
 12 Phone: (202) 371-2600
 13 Email: jcrozendaal@sternekessler.com
 14 Email: mjoffre@sternekessler.com
 15 Email: dwells@sternekessler.com
 16 Email: joskim@sternekessler.com
 17 Email: kckelly@sternekessler.com

/s/ Gabriel S. Gross

Gabriel S. Gross (Cal. Bar No. 254672)
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
 140 Scott Drive
 Menlo Park, CA 94025
 Phone: (650) 328-4600
 Email: gabe.gross@lw.com

Gabrielle LaHatte (Cal. Bar No. 321844)
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000
 San Francisco, California 94111
 Telephone: (415) 391-0600
 Email: gabe.gross@lw.com
 Email: gabrielle.lahatte@lw.com

Jamie D. Underwood (*pro hac vice*)
 Michael A. David (*pro hac vice*)
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
 555 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 1000
 Washington, D.C. 20004-1304
 Telephone: (202) 637-2200
 Email: jamie.underwood@lw.com
 Email: michael.david@lw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Ascendis Pharma A/S,
 Ascendis Pharma Growth Disorders A/S, and
 Ascendis Pharma, Inc.*